

**g**EOFF **b**ERRY **a**SSOCIATES

# **RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY REPORT**

**2007**

**Geoff Berry Associates**

*82 Barnfield Way, Stafford. ST17 4NB*

*Tel: 01785 665998*

*E-mail: [geoffrey.berry@btconnect.com](mailto:geoffrey.berry@btconnect.com)*

**RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**2007 COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY REPORT**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Management summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Background</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Residents survey findings</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. Focus Group Responses</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>5. Survey of the business community</b>	<b>50</b>

## **MANAGEMENT SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of the perceptions of those living and working in the Runnymede Borough area, with regard to community safety issues, compared to such views three years ago.

The residents' survey, which exhibits a statistically significant overall response rate of 30%, reveals that most resident concerns continue to focus upon quality of life issues such as loud/fast cars, parking on pavements, litter and dog fouling. Indeed, the six highest priorities fall into this category, with the first "crime" on the list being vandalism and damage, at number seven (in the 2004 survey, the first crime was ninth on the list).

Overall, while quality of life concerns still dominate, the level of concern has stabilised somewhat, while concern for crime problems is growing again, though the number of respondents expressing concern is still relatively small.

A slightly higher proportion of respondents had been victims of crime compared to 2004 and many of these were in relation to vandalism. Perceptions specifically with regard to crime problems are significantly higher than actual victimisation rates. This suggests that there is a need to reassure the public about the very small probability of them becoming a victim of crime.

One quarter of respondents feel that fear of crime affects their lifestyle, compared to 22% in 2004, fuelled primarily by the reporting of crime in the media and the perceived level of crime in their area. Despite relatively low victimisation rates in relation to both crime and anti-social behaviour, one in four of all respondents are still fearful of becoming a crime victim. The message needs to be reinforced that the Runnymede Borough area continues to be a very safe part of the country in which to live and work.

Just over a quarter of those surveyed identified areas where they feel particularly unsafe, as in 2004. These relate mainly to the three main town centre areas, but particularly Chertsey. In addition, 17% stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour, compared to 16% in 2004. A quarter of these had taken place outside the individuals' home with many of the remainder taking place in town centre areas. Satisfaction with the area remains high, though there has been something a shift from very satisfied to satisfied.

Awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme has continued to fall, maintaining a trend since 2001. There has been a significant increase in awareness of PCSOs and neighbourhood officers reflecting the recent adoption of neighbourhood policing. While awareness of generic crime prevention initiatives such as neighbourhood watch and property marking continues to be relatively high, it has also fallen consistently since 2001, while awareness of local schemes remains generally low.

While focus groups were held with vulnerable people and elderly people, young people took part in the postal survey through a number of local schools. Young people are generally more concerned about problems overall than respondents to the resident's survey, but significantly so in relation to vandalism, drugs misuse, litter, dog fouling and young people hanging around. Victimisation and fear of crime has fallen in the young people's group however since 2004.

Key concerns of the elderly group are also quality of life issues but there has been a significant increase in concern regarding crime problems. A significant proportion of the elderly group also feel that the crime and disorder situation has worsened in the last twelve months.

The major concern of the vulnerable group is young people hanging around and it is clear that this is fuelling fear of crime in a significant number of them. As a result, their satisfaction with the neighbourhood has fallen.

The business survey reveals generally lower levels of concern than in 2004, particularly in relation to alcohol abuse and disorder. The primary concerns of businesses remain young people hanging around and traffic related problems. The level of provision for crime prevention has fallen again, continuing a trend that stretches back to 1998 and this is a source of some concern.

In summary, the findings from the surveys suggest that the following areas should be the focus for attention in the future:

- The further reduction of crimes in the area, particularly vandalism, burglary and thefts from vehicles.
- Continued focus on traffic related and road safety issues such as speeding, abandoned vehicles and dangerous parking.
- Re-doubling efforts to re-assure the community in the area regarding their safety, in order to further reduce the fear of crime. In particular, this should address the gap between perceived risk of becoming a victim and actual victimisation.
- Continued attention to the problem of anti-social behaviour across the Borough area, particularly in town centre areas. Specific attention could also be given to addressing the concerns raised by those vulnerable groups in the community.
- A focus on addressing the needs of young people as victims of crime, both actual and potential.
- Intensive marketing and publicity of crime reduction opportunities and initiatives across the Borough area, particularly generic initiatives such as crimestoppers and property marking.
- Better marketing of and support for existing and new neighbourhood watch schemes.
- Increased efforts to encourage businesses to seriously consider crime and the potential effects of becoming a victim. This should be linked with projects encouraging them to be more proactive in adopting crime reduction measures.

In summary, levels of concern, fear of crime and victimisation have stabilised somewhat and are significantly lower than they were some ten years ago at the launch of the Safer Runnymede Centre and the Community Safety Partnership. All of those responsible for community safety in the Runnymede Borough area should again be much encouraged by the findings of the surveys and should ensure that efforts should now seek to build further upon the current positive situation.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of perceptions of those living and working in the Runnymede Borough area, with regard to community safety issues. Perceptions were gathered through a variety of survey methods and the results will inform both the community safety strategic assessment process and the continual review and development of the community safety strategy for the Borough area.

Where appropriate, survey data has been compared to baseline data and previous surveys. Such comparisons will enable conclusions to be drawn regarding the possible impact of the strategy and its' component parts. It will also highlight areas of concern, which may require future attention.

As far as practicable, the methodology used in this survey exercise mirrors that of previous exercises. This will support the validity of comparisons between the various sets of data.

The data from the 2007 exercise (outlined in this report) is compared with data from the audit surveys of 2004, which will allow strict comparison over the 3-year period of the strategy.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Residents survey**

The residents' survey was carried out by means of a postal questionnaire to a 5% sample of residents in the Borough area. The sample was drawn from the electoral roll and stratified in relation to ward of residence, enabling ward by ward analyses to take place.

All questionnaires were returned directly to Geoff Berry Associates by means of a freepost return. It was felt that this would enhance the response rate and reinforce the fact that the survey was being carried out by an independent organisation.

A total of 3158 questionnaires were issued in June 2007.

### **2.2 Survey of young people**

In past surveys the views of young people have been gathered through the use of focus groups. While this was a valid method, it was felt that the numbers of responses were relatively small.

It was therefore decided to change the approach adopted and for the 2007 survey, postal questionnaires have been issued to schools together with a stock of freepost reply envelopes. These schools have been requested to issue these to students as they see fit in order that the young people might complete and return them directly to the researchers.

A total of 500 questionnaires were issued to schools in the Borough area.

### **2.3 Focus Groups – Elderly and vulnerable**

Previous surveys have taken account of the views of two significant “minority” groups in the population, namely the young and the elderly. As noted above, the focus groups for young people have not taken place during the 2007 exercise but those for the elderly have been repeated during this survey exercise, using the same questionnaire as that issued to residents, as a basis for the collection of the data. In addition, the views of a small number of “vulnerable” individuals were sought using the same approach.

It is recognised that strictly according to the definition, these might not be viewed as focus groups. However, as they focus on specific groups of the population the term is used throughout the report for purposes of brevity and for consistency with previous survey reports.

## **2.4 Business survey**

The business survey was carried out by use of a postal questionnaire to a sample of businesses in the Borough, drawn from a list compiled by Runnymede Borough Council and a total of 500 questionnaires were issued. Replies were again sent directly to us using freepost envelopes.

### 3 RESIDENTS SURVEY FINDINGS

#### 3.3 Profile of respondents

A total of 947 postal surveys were returned which represents an overall response rate of 30%. This is an acceptable and statistically significant response rate and compares well with the 33% achieved in the previous Borough wide survey in 2004. An accepted benchmark for response rates is 25% and this survey clearly exceeds that by some distance.

Some 42.2% of respondents were Male and 57.8% were Female compared to 39.7% and 60.3% respectively in the 2004 survey. The gender split of both surveys is, therefore, slightly more skewed towards female respondents, though the 2007 survey is more equable in terms of representation.

Table 3.1 below shows the age profile of respondents compared to the 2004 and 2001 surveys.

	<b>Under 24</b>	<b>24-44</b>	<b>45-64</b>	<b>65+</b>
<b>2007 survey</b>	6.9%	26.8%	36.7%	29.6%
<b>2004 survey</b>	4.5%	30.3%	37.9%	27.3%
<b>2001 survey</b>	2.2%	30.1%	35.5%	32.2%

**Table 3.1: Age profile of survey respondents**

The latest survey shows that 66% of respondents were over 45, compared with 65% in 2004. There is a higher proportion of respondents aged under 24 but a lower proportion of those aged 24 to 44, compared to the previous two survey exercises.

Some 59% of respondents have lived in the area for over ten years, almost exactly the same as in the 2004 survey (60%). This survey, therefore, still primarily represents the views of people well established in the community.

With regard to response rates by ward, Table 3.2 shows the rates for the latest survey compared to the previous Borough wide survey exercise in 2004.

<b>WARD</b>	<b>2004 Survey</b>	<b>2007 Survey</b>
<b>Addlestone North</b>	35%	25%
<b>Addlestone Bourneside</b>	36%	28%
<b>Chertsey South &amp; Rowtown</b>	36%	34%
<b>Chertsey Meads</b>	32%	30%
<b>Chertsey St. Ann's</b>	29%	28%
<b>Egham Town</b>	37%	29%
<b>Englefield Green East</b>	22%	27%
<b>Englefield Green West</b>	31%	27%
<b>Foxhills</b>	34%	32%
<b>Egham Hythe</b>	28%	30%
<b>New Haw</b>	31%	29%
<b>Thorpe</b>	33%	31%
<b>Virginia Water</b>	38%	34%
<b>Woodham</b>	41%	38%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>30%</b>

**Table 3.2: Survey response rates by ward**

While generally response rates are slightly down in most wards compared to the 2004 survey, response rates for Woodham, Virginia Water and Chertsey South & Rowtown were particularly impressive. The lowest response rate was from Addlestone North, with 25% of those surveyed responding, though this still provides an acceptable and statistically significant sample. Other than this, the rate did not dip below 27% for any ward and as a result, the sample is felt to be representative both as a whole and across each ward.

### **3.4 Perceived crime problems**

Respondents were asked if they felt whether or not their area suffered particular crime or public order problems and if so, whether they were major or small problems. The proportion of respondents citing major problems in the latest survey is shown in Table 3.3 in rank order. Comparisons are also shown with the findings from the 2004 survey.

	2007	2004
Loud/fast cars and motorcycles	34.2	28.9
Parking on pavements/verges	23.6	19.5
Litter	23.5	23.9
Dog fouling	20.3	21.7
Young people hanging around	20.2	20.3
Cycling on pavements	18.3	16.0
Damage and vandalism	16.9	17.1
Other vehicle nuisance	14.7	N/a
Vehicles broken into	13.4	10.9
Under age drinking	12.8	10.0
Burglary	10.8	8.5
Disorder in public places	9.9	8.6
Alcohol abuse	8.3	7.2
Drug misuse (dealers and users)	6.0	3.6
Vehicles being stolen	5.9	4.9
Loud music/parties	5.3	5.5
Abandoned vehicles	4.1	N/a
Neighbours	4.0	4.0
Minor assault	3.5	2.2
Street robbery	3.2	2.2
Empty, derelict buildings	2.9	3.7

**Table 3.3: Percentage of respondents who perceive major crime and anti-social behaviour problems.**

There has been a slight increase in the level of concern in twelve of the 21 categories, a reduction in 6 categories, one has remained the same and two cannot be compared with the 2004 survey. While overall concerns still focus on quality of life type problems, it is worth noting that most of the increases are in relation to traditional crime related problems such as burglary and vehicle crime.

Notwithstanding the reductions in some categories, the six highest priorities are what might be seen as “quality of life” issues, with the first “crime” on the list being damage and vandalism, at number seven. Even for this, however, only one in six of those surveyed feel that this is a problem.

There continues to be a high level of concern in relation to traffic-related issues and road safety and noise nuisance. The level of concern regarding young people hanging around and alcohol abuse has remained relatively stable while there has been an increase in concern regarding drug misuse though this only relates to small numbers of responses.

When the proportion of respondents who felt that an issue was a small problem is added the ranking list changes slightly, with greater concern in relation to burglary theft from vehicles, dog fouling and litter.

Overall, while quality of life concerns still dominate, the level of concern has stabilised somewhat, while concern for crime problems is growing again, though the number of respondents expressing concern is still relatively small.

There are “hotspots” where perceived major problems are greater than the Borough average. Listed below are the crime and crime related problems, again ranked, highlighting those wards whose responses are significantly higher than the Borough average.

Where known, the figures of the 2004 survey are included in brackets.

### **3.2.1 Loud/fast cars & motorcycles – Borough average 34.2% (28.9%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green West – 46% (44%)
- Thorpe – 44%
- Addlestone North – 38%
- Chertsey South & Rowtown – 38%
- Foxhills – 38% (36%)
- New Haw – 38% (40%)

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Englefield Green East – now 36% compared to 44% in 2004.
- Egham Hythe – now 24% compared to 37% in 2004

### **3.2.2 Parking on pavements and verges – Borough average 23.6% (19.5%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green West – 46% (26%)
- Chertsey South & Rowtown – 32% (24%)
- Egham Town – 31% (26%)
- Addlestone North – 29%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Addlestone Bourneside – 18% now compared to 26% in 2004

### **3.2.3 Litter – Borough average 23.5% (23.9%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chertsey St. Anne’s – 32% (33%)
- New Haw – 32%

- Addlestone Bourneside – 31% (28%)

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Egham Hythe – 26% now compared to 36% in 2004
- Egham Town – 24% now compared to 28% in 2004

### **3.2.4 Dog Fouling – Borough average 20.3% (21.7%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Addlestone North – 29%
- Addlestone Bourneside – 29% (27%)
- Chertsey Meads – 27%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Chertsey St. Ann's – 23% now compared to 26% in 2004
- Egham Town – 18% now compared to 30% in 2004

### **3.2.5 Young people hanging around – Borough average 20.2% (20.3%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Addlestone Bourneside – 37% (28%)
- Woodham – 37% (29%)
- Addlestone North – 29% (32%)
- Egham Hythe – 28% (30%)
- New Haw – 28%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Chertsey St. Ann's – 26% now compared to 31% in 2004

### **3.2.6 Cycling on pavements – Borough average 18.3% (16.0%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Addlestone North – 29% (25%)
- Woodham – 27%
- Addlestone Bourneside – 26% (30%)

### **3.2.7 Damage and vandalism – Borough average 16.9% (17.1%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Addlestone Bourneside – 31% (24%)
- Egham Hythe – 24% (28%)
- Woodham – 23%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Addlestone North – 21% now compared to 24% in 2004

### **3.2.8 Other vehicle nuisance – Borough average 14.7%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Thorpe – 22%
- Englefield Green West – 20%
- Egham Town – 19%
- Chertsey South & Rowtown – 19%

### **3.2.9 Vehicles broken into – Borough average 13.4% (10.9%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green West – 28% (18%)
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 21% (15%)

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Foxhills – 6% now compared to 16% in 2004.

### **3.2.10 Under age drinking – Borough average 12.8% (10%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Woodham – 33%
- Addlestone North – 25% (21%)
- Addlestone Bourneside – 23% (16%)

### **3.2.11 Burglary – Borough average 10.8% (8.5%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green East – 19% (16%)
- Chertsey Meads – 19% (15%)
- Virginia Water – 17% (15%)
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 16%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Egham Town – 6% now compared to 12% in 2004.

### **3.2.12 Disorder in public places – Borough average 9.9% (8.6%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Woodham – 22%
- Englefield Green West – 20% (13%)
- Egham Hythe – 16% (12%)
- Addlestone Bourneside – 16%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Englefield Green East – nil now compared to 14% in 2004
- Addlestone North – 10% now compared to 14% in 2004.

### **3.2.13 Alcohol abuse – Borough average 8.3% (7.2%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Woodham – 19%
- Addlestone Bourneside – 15% (15%)
- Egham Hythe – 14% (12%)
- Englefield Green West – 14%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Egham Town – 7% now compared to 14% in 2004.
- Englefield Green East – 3% now compared to 12% in 2004

### **3.2.14 Drug misuse – Borough average 6.0% (3.6%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chertsey South & Rowtown – 12%
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 12%
- Egham Hythe – 12% (9%)

### **3.2.15 Vehicles being stolen – Borough average 5.9% (4.9%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green West – 14%
- Thorpe – 10%
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 10%

### **3.2.16 Loud music/parties – Borough average 5.3% (5.5%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green West – 14% (16%)
- Egham Town – 10%

Problem areas identified in the 2004 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Englefield Green East – 5% now compared to 14% in 2004

The remaining five problems on the list are not shown as they only represent very small numbers, which are not statistically significant. Overall, less than one in twenty surveyed felt that these were significant problems across the Borough. The only significant variations from the Borough average in relation to these five categories are listed below. The data needs to be treated with some caution, however, as these relate to small numbers.

- Neighbour disputes – Englefield Green West 10%, Chertsey St. Ann's 10%.
- Minor assault – Egham Town – 8% (8% in 2004)
- Street robbery – Chertsey St. Ann's 7%
- Empty, derelict buildings – Addlestone North 13% (10% in 2004), Egham Hythe 10%.

The wards of Englefield Green West and Addlestone Bourneside appear most often in the above lists, indicating that the level of concern is greatest in those areas. (In 2004 greatest concern was expressed in Egham Hythe and Addlestone Bourneside).

In the 2004 survey Thorpe did not appear in any of these lists, while it now appears three times. In addition, in 2004 three wards appeared once but in 2007 they have appeared more frequently, namely:

- Chertsey South & Rowtown – 4 times in 2007
- Chertsey Meads – twice in 2007
- Woodham - six times in 2007

This suggests that the level of concern in these wards is increasing.

Every ward features at least once in these lists and just three wards appear only once, namely Foxhills, Virginia Water and Englefield Green East.

Respondents were asked if there were any other crime or crime related problems, which they perceived in their areas. Many problems mentioned restate some of the issues listed above, notably obstructive parking and other parking and traffic offences. Of the other problems, many offences were only highlighted by one or two respondents and just one slight issue did emerge namely:

- Fly tipping – 1.3% (1.0% in 2004)

It should not be forgotten that strength of feeling about these issues was such that individuals felt compelled to comment specifically on them.

### **3.5 Victims of crime**

Some 14.7% of respondents had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months compared to 12.3% in 2004. Of these, 39% had been victims of vandalism compared to 36% in 2004. Some 19% had been victims of theft from vehicle (13% in 2004) and 16% had been victim of a burglary (11% in 2004).

The majority of respondents who are vandalism victims are from Egham Hythe and Woodham wards but it is stressed that, once again, the data relates to small numbers and should therefore be treated cautiously.

Table 3.4 compares the perception of problems with the victimisation in the last twelve months.

	<b>% who perceive a problem</b>	<b>% who have been a victim</b>
Damage and vandalism	16.9	5.7
Vehicles broken into	13.4	2.7
Burglary	10.8	2.3
Vehicles being stolen	5.9	0.7
Minor assault	3.5	0.3
Street robbery	3.2	0.3

**Table 3.4: Percentage of respondents who perceive major crime problems compared to percentage who have been a victim in the last twelve months.**

This clearly shows that the perception of crime problems is far greater than the likelihood that any one individual will become a victim of crime for selected crime categories. The difference between perception and reality for theft from vehicle and burglary is particularly striking.

Some 66% of victims had suffered a crime only once during the year (74% in 2004), but 22% had been a victim twice (18% in 2004). Almost two-thirds of these had suffered vandalism with the remainder spread over a number of offence types. No particular ward was more prevalent than others in relation to repeat victimisation.

Of those who had been victims, some 68% reported the crime to police compared to 63% in 2004. This reporting rate may, to some extent, reflect the nature of the offences of which they were victims. The reporting rate for vandalism is recognised as traditionally low and this type of crime is the one which most respondents were a victim of, in the latest survey.

When asked why they did not report just over 40% stated that it was waste of time as the police were unlikely to pursue it so there was no point. In addition, a quarter stated that there was little chance of catching the offender and as a result, there was little point in reporting the matter. A small number of others stated that they did not report the crime as it was a very minor occurrence and not worth reporting.

Just 8% of those who did report the crime, knew the offender (17% in 2004) and all except two of these told the police. This reinforces the findings above and suggests that individuals are more inclined to report if they believe that there is a reasonable chance that the offender will be apprehended.

Of those who did report the crime, less than half (45%) were not satisfied with the service that they received from Surrey Police, which is a significant improvement on the 55% recorded in 2004. The main criticism was that the police “did not seem to be bothered” and seemed uninterested as “there was little that they could do”.

Finally, respondents were asked if they knew anyone who had been a victim of crime in the previous twelve months. Some 25% replied that they did so (the same as in 2004) and of these, 33% said they knew someone who had been a victim of burglary (41% in 2004). The remainder said they knew people who had been victims of, primarily, damage, theft from vehicles and general theft.

### 3.6 Fear of crime

Some 25% of respondents stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle in some way, compared to 22% in the 2004 survey. This comprises, 22% of male respondents (22% in 2004) and 28% of female respondents (22% in 2004).

Age and gender analysis of respondents fearful becoming a victim of crime is of some interest.

	Under 24		24-44		45-64		65+	
	2007	2004	2007	2004	2007	2004	2007	2004
<b>Male</b>	19.0%	7.1%	21.4%	18.6%	24.8%	28.4%	18.5%	20.4%
<b>Female</b>	27.2%	17.2%	32.9%	23.4%	31.1%	18.1%	17.9%	15.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	24.6%	13.9%	29.1%	21.7%	28.4%	22.1%	18.2%	18.1%

**Table 3.5: Proportion of total respondents who stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle, by age grouping.**

Table 3.5 clearly shows that fear of crime is focused in the middle age groups in males. There has been a shift in the last three years in that there is a higher proportion of younger males who are fearful of becoming a victim of crime than in 2004.

Fear of crime has increased across all female age groups and significantly so for all age groups apart from those aged 65 and over. This is important as it will influence the targeting of activity and advice designed to address fear of crime.

With regard to the type of crime of which respondents were most fearful, four main responses were given, namely:

- Burglary – 34% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (40% in 2004)
- Assault – 18% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (14% in 2004)
- Gangs of young people – 10% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (9% in 2004).
- Robbery/Mugging – 6% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (13% in 2004).

In addition, 10% stated that they were not fearful of any specific crime, but just fearful of becoming a victim of crime generally.

From a gender perspective, a higher proportion of males (particularly older males) than females state that fear of becoming a victim of burglary affects their lifestyle. The reverse is true for all of the other categories, perhaps not surprisingly.

Before too much is made of these figures, they are of interest when set against the context of the overall survey as Table 3.6 below illustrates.

	<b>% who feel it is a major problem</b>	<b>% who state fear affects their life</b>
Burglary dwelling	10.8	8.6
Assault	3.5	4.5
Robbery/Mugging	3.2	1.6
Gangs of young people	20.2	2.6

**Table 3.6: Proportion of total respondents who stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle, compared to overall concern about crime.**

For the first three categories the proportion who feel it is a major problem (from Table 3.3 above) is broadly similar to the proportion who say that their lifestyle is affected by it. With regard to gangs of young people hanging around however, while 20.2% of those surveyed feel that is a major problem in their area only 2.6% state that it affects their lifestyle.

Three main responses emerged when asked about how it affected their lifestyle:

- 16% said that fear of crime prevented them going out after dark, compared to 19% in 2004 and 28% in 2001.
- 20% said that it made them very careful about locking and securing their home both when in their home and if they left it at any time, compared to 18% in 2004 and 40% in 2001.
- 10% stated that it made them very wary generally, when out and about compared to 11% in 2004.

From a geographical perspective, fear of crime seems to be most prevalent in Englefield Green West (34% of respondents), Woodham (36% compared to 27% in 2004) and Chertsey South & Rowtown (32% compared to 27% in 2004). Two of these three wards, Woodham and Chertsey St. Ann's were in the top three in the 2004 and 2001 surveys.

Respondents were then asked what the major contributory factors were to their fear of crime. In previous surveys, crime and incidents reported in the media was **the** major contributory factor. This is still an issue, with 53% of those who said they were fearful, citing this as the main reason (43% in 2004).

Some 50% stated that their fear was fuelled by the apparent level of crime in their area, compared to 51% in 2004. This factor has therefore remained constant in the last three years. While small numbers are involved, (and hence the results should be treated with caution), the fear of crime through the perceived level of crime in the area was most prevalent in Chertsey South & Rowtown.

As in the 2004 and 2001 surveys, just over one-third of those who were fearful of crime suggested that the primary cause was their being a past victim. As only 15% of all respondents had been victims in the last twelve months, this again suggests that being a victim of crime has a long lasting impact.

Police drama on TV and lack of victim support were not seen as significant contributory factors to the fear of crime, though some 9% said that lack of a visible police presence was (the same as in 2004).

### **3.5 Perceived safety by Area**

Respondents were asked if they felt either particularly safe or unsafe in any area of the Borough and if so, why. Some 28% of respondents answered this question, compared to 27% in 2004.

Interestingly, the two areas perceived to be the most unsafe by those who answered this question were Staines and Weybridge railway station, both of which lie outside the Runnymede Borough Council boundaries. Within the Runnymede area three locations were identified by a number of respondents, namely:

- New Haw Broadway and shops (8% of those responding to this question). The main reason put forward was the number of young people hanging around the area.
- Chertsey town centre during the hours of darkness (7% of those responding to this question). The main reason put forward was groups of young people hanging around.
- Any of the town centres but particularly Chertsey (6% of those responding to this question). The main reason put forward was groups of young people hanging around.

The following areas were also suggested as unsafe by 5 or more respondents to this question:

- Pooley Green area at night

- Egham town centre
- Addlestone railway station
- Addlestone High Street
- Railway stations generally
- Anywhere at closing time

In all of these cases, the presence of groups of young people was put forward as the primary reason for feeling unsafe.

### **3.6 Anti-social behaviour**

Respondents were then asked if they had been a victim of anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the last three years and if so, the nature, time and location of the incident. Some 17% of all respondents stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour in the last three years compared to 16% in 2004.

Of these incidents:

- 23% had taken place during the last year (28% in 2004)
- 12% had taken place between 1 and 2 years ago (3% in 2004)
- 8% had taken place during the last three months (7% in 2004)

In addition, 31% said that these incidents happened all of the time and were ongoing compared to 29% in 2004.

In terms of location, 24% of the incidents (40% in 2004) took place outside the home of the respondents and the majority of these fell into three categories of verbal abuse, loud music and minor vandalism. Of the remainder, the following areas were identified by five or more respondents:

- Egham High Street (verbal abuse)
- Addlestone town centre (verbal abuse, threatening behaviour)

In terms of type of behaviour, two broad categories dominated, namely:

- Verbal abuse – 22% of ASB victims (21% in 2004)
- Aggressive/threatening behaviour – 27% of ASB victims (38% in 2004)

The other categories identified by fewer respondents include:

- Minor vandalism and damage
- Loud music from neighbours
- Noise nuisance generally
- Under age drinking

### **3.7 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood**

Respondents were then asked how satisfied they were with the neighbourhood in which they live. The responses are summarised, by ward, in table 3.7 below.

WARD	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied	
	2007	2004	2007	2004	2007	2004	2007	2004
Addlestone North	14%	32%	79%	57%	4%	7%	-	3%
Addlestone Bourneside	32%	28%	56%	62%	10%	7%	2%	-
Chertsey South & Rowtown	32%	41%	59%	54%	5%	4%	1%	-
New Haw	34%	22%	57%	60%	6%	6%	-	-
Woodham	37%	51%	53%	44%	7%	4%	1%	-
Chertsey St. Ann's	32%	30%	59%	59%	7%	8%	1%	2%
Chertsey Meads	36%	43%	57%	53%	4%	3%	-	2%
Foxhills	53%	41%	47%	50%	-	7%	-	-
Egham Town	37%	29%	55%	61%	1%	5%	6%	4%
Egham Hythe	24%	24%	68%	63%	3%	6%	4%	3%
Virginia Water	57%	58%	38%	40%	4%	-	-	-
Thorpe	34%	36%	59%	53%	4%	9%	-	-
Englefield Green West	22%	44%	56%	45%	18%	7%	-	5%
Englefield Green East	50%	42%	45%	44%	3%	9%	2%	2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Table 3.7: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, by ward.

This data is encouraging and shows that over nine out of ten respondents are still either satisfied or very satisfied with the neighbourhood in which they live (92% compared to 91% in 2004). The shift from very satisfied to satisfied identified in the 2004 survey has continued in the latest survey, in most of the wards.

Levels of dissatisfaction are highest in Addlestone Bourneside, Woodham, Chertsey St. Ann's, Egham Town, Egham Hythe and Englefield Green West It is stressed however that these relate to small numbers only.

Respondents were then asked whether they felt that the crime and disorder situation had changed in the last twelve months and if so, how and why.

<b>WARD</b>	<b>Improved</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Addlestone North</b>	9%	70%	5%	16%
<b>Addlestone Bourneside</b>	5%	63%	11%	21%
<b>Chertsey South &amp; Rowtown</b>	9%	65%	14%	12%
<b>New Haw</b>	9%	62%	14%	15%
<b>Woodham</b>	14%	51%	21%	14%
<b>Chertsey St. Ann's</b>	12%	60%	10%	18%
<b>Chertsey Meads</b>	6%	67%	8%	19%
<b>Foxhills</b>	3%	76%	7%	14%
<b>Egham Town</b>	7%	55%	15%	22%
<b>Egham Hythe</b>	7%	62%	9%	22%
<b>Virginia Water</b>	6%	60%	17%	17%
<b>Thorpe</b>	8%	64%	16%	12%
<b>Englefield Green West</b>	8%	54%	12%	26%
<b>Englefield Green East</b>	-	69%	5%	26%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>17%</b>

**Table 3.8: Perceptions of respondents regarding the change in the crime and disorder situation in the last twelve months.**

Table 3.8 shows that almost two-thirds of all respondents feel that the crime and disorder situation has not changed in the last twelve months, while 12% feel that it has worsened and 8% feel that it has improved.

There are significant variations across the wards. Those wards where there is felt to be most improvement are Woodham and Chertsey St. Ann's, while those felt to have worsened most are Woodham, Virginia Water, Thorpe and Egham Town. The case of Woodham is of interest in that it shows both the greatest improvement and greatest deterioration. This suggests that there is a polarisation of views in the respondents from Woodham and this is reinforced by the fact that the ward also has one of the lowest percentages of "don't knows".

When looking at why respondents felt that there had been an improvement the major reason put forward is the greater presence of PCSO and police officers on the streets. Other reasons put forward include fewer gangs or young people on the streets and fewer burglaries.

In relation to those who felt that the situation had worsened, the major reason suggested was more gangs hanging around, more vandalism and lack of a police presence.

### 3.8 Crime prevention measures

Respondents were offered a list of measures which might help to reduce opportunities to commit crime and asked to state whether they felt they were adequate or needed improving. Table 3.9 below highlights the percentage that felt that facilities needed improving.

Measure	2001	2004	2007
Closing passageways	10.6%	11.5%	13.6%
Better Lighting	32.0%	27.0%	32.9%
More Police patrol	74.0%	72.8%	69.2%
Design of buildings	11.4%	12.8%	13.5%

**Table 3.9: Percentage of respondents who believe measures need improving.**

The level of satisfaction with the provision of crime prevention measures seems to be at broadly the same level as in the previous two audit surveys, with the exception of street lighting where satisfaction is falling.

Concern with regard to closure of passageways was greatest in Englefield Green East as in 2004.

Concern with regard to better lighting was greatest in Addlestone North and both Englefield Green wards.

It is interesting to note that the proportion of respondents who feel that there should be more police patrol has continued to fall. This may reflect the views expressed in section 3.7 regarding the greater visibility of police officers and PCSO. Having said that, over two-thirds of all respondents would still like to see more police patrolling. This is particularly the case for Chertsey St. Ann's.

Concern with regard to new building design was greatest in Egham Hythe and Englefield Green West.

Respondents were asked to suggest other crime prevention measures that might prove effective and three responses dominated, namely:

- The need for visible and accessible police patrol - 7% of all respondents (7% in 2004)
- Extension of the CCTV scheme – 3% of all respondents (as in 2004)
- More activities for young people to reduce the opportunities for them to be drawn into crime and nuisance – 3% of respondents (as in 2004)

Other suggestions put forward by at least 5 respondents were:

- More appropriate punishment for offenders
- Lower speed limits and tighter traffic control.
- Provide more bins
- Make parents responsible for their children's actions
- Remove illegally parked vehicles
- Curfews for young people
- Move on travellers

### **3.9 The CCTV scheme**

Respondents were asked whether they were aware of the CCTV scheme in the Borough and if so, whether they thought it was having an effect. The results of both surveys are summarised in Table 3.10 below.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Those aware of CCTV</b>	84%	70%	62%
<b>% who think it will reduce crime</b>	73%	62%	55%
<b>% who think it will reduce fear of crime</b>	53%	45%	43%
<b>% who think it will increase detection of crime</b>	80%	65%	59%

**Table 3.10: Perceptions with regard to the CCTV scheme**

The awareness of the scheme across the Borough has continued to fall and the proportion of respondents who perceive that the system has a positive impact has fallen to its lowest level since it was introduced.

In common with previous surveys and those in other parts of the country, there is less perceived impact on the fear of crime.

There is slightly greater awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme expressed by male respondents than female. In addition, there is greater awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme expressed by older respondents.

It is perhaps not surprising that awareness of CCTV is greater in those areas where the scheme has been in place for longest, especially Addlestone and Chertsey while the lowest level of awareness is 42% in Englefield Green East and Thorpe.

### **3.10 Other crime prevention measures**

Respondents were offered a list of crime prevention schemes currently running in the area and asked to state whether or not they were aware of them. Their responses are outlined below.

<b>INITIATIVE</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Community safety strategy</b>	15%	9%	6%
<b>PCSO/Community Constables</b>	20%	36%	56%
<b>Crimestoppers</b>	28%	28%	25%
<b>Neighbourhood Specialist Officers</b>	N/a	11%	19%
<b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>	69%	56%	52%
<b>Property marking</b>	35%	25%	21%
<b>Pub Watch</b>	12%	19%	18%
<b>Bogus Caller Initiative</b>	N/a	13%	11%
<b>Vehicle crime awareness</b>	N/a	10%	10%
<b>Victim support</b>	24%	28%	19%
<b>ASB reporting form</b>	N/a	N/a	5%

**Table 3.11: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

Table 3.11 clearly shows how the awareness of PCSO and neighbourhood officers has increased significantly since 2004. This reflects the considerable efforts put into the launch and operation of neighbourhood policing.

Awareness of most other initiatives has fallen slightly since 2004, though awareness of victim support has fallen significantly. There appears to be little awareness, as yet, of the recently introduced anti-social behaviour reporting process.

While there is a slight reduction in awareness of Neighbourhood Watch, there are pockets where awareness remains much lower, notably Englefield Green West (38%), Chertsey St. Ann's (41%) and Egham Hythe 35% (31% in 2004).

Only 6% of respondents are aware of the community safety strategy, despite the fact that it has now been in place for almost nine years. It might be that important and valuable advice is available to residents of the area, which may reduce their fear of crime or likelihood that they might become victims of crime. They need to be told, however, that such initiatives are available, how they can help and where they can be accessed.

### 3.11 Positive action to reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim

Respondents were asked what measures they took, and how often they took them, to reduce the likelihood that they would become a crime victim.

	Never (%)		Some times (%)		Usually (%)		Always (%)		N/A (%)	
	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	1	0	0	1	2	2	95	97	2	0
<b>Set burglar alarm when leaving home</b>	14	11	2	2	3	2	18	19	63	66
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	4	3	14	15	24	27	52	50	6	5
<b>Lock car when leaving it</b>	0	0	1	1	3	5	85	83	11	11
<b>Keep all valuables in car, out of sight</b>	1	1	1	1	7	9	79	78	12	11
<b>Set car alarm when leaving it</b>	2	2	1	1	2	3	56	51	39	43
<b>Active member of Neighbourhood watch</b>	21	18	3	5	4	3	9	8	63	66
<b>Ask neighbours to “keep an eye” on property.</b>	8	7	10	9	15	17	56	58	11	9

**Table 3.12: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim.**

There is little variation between the results in 2004 and the latest survey, with the slight exception of better car security.

#### 3.11.1 Locking home

The very high proportion of respondents who always lock their home is encouraging and there is little variation in terms of area, age or gender.

#### 3.11.2 Setting burglar alarms

Some 63% of respondents noted that this measure was “not applicable” (66% in 2004 and 70% in 2001), indicating that a higher proportion do now have burglar alarms.

### ***3.11.3 Checking caller's identity***

Half of respondents now always check the identity of callers to their home and (48% of male and 54% of female respondents). As in 2004, for both male and female respondents, the older that they are, the more likely they are to check caller identity which is encouraging.

There is little variation across the wards with the exception of Woodham, Virginia Water and Englefield Green East, where only 43%, 45% and 46% of respondents respectively, stated that they always checked the identity of callers to their home.

### ***3.11.4 Locking cars***

Again the majority of respondents always lock their cars when leaving them. The 11% suggesting that this measure is not applicable indicates the level of non-car ownership. Again, there is little variation in terms of area, age or gender.

### ***3.11.5 Keeping valuables out of sight***

A slightly smaller proportion of those owning cars, always keep valuables out of sight when leaving their cars. The gender split is broadly equal to the overall average. In terms of age, however, those in the middle age groups are more likely to keep valuables hidden, as in 2004. This may be a function of the possible higher levels of car ownership for these age groups. There is little variation across the wards.

### ***3.11.6 Setting car alarms***

Again the high proportion of respondents who state that this is not applicable suggests that many do not have car alarms, though this is significantly lower than in 2004. It is also worth remembering however that many new cars now come with automatic alarm systems that do not have to be "set" as such. This might therefore also explain the high proportion of not applicable responses to this question.

There is significant gender variation, with 61% of male respondents stating that they always set car alarms, compared to just 52% of female respondents (57% and 48% respectively in 2004). This again may be partly a function on non-car ownership. As in 2004, middle aged male respondents in the age categories 35 to 64 are most likely to always set their car alarms. This might indicate both car ownership and the fact that the value and type of vehicles owned at those ages are worth protecting.

### ***3.11.7 Active member of Neighbourhood Watch***

The fact that 63% (66% in 2004) of respondents suggest that this measure is not applicable and that a further 21% (18% in 2004) never become actively involved, suggests a lack of neighbourhood watch schemes across the Borough. Several respondents requested more information about joining or setting up schemes.

Areas with highest levels of "not applicable" and/or non-participation are New Haw and Chertsey St. Ann's. Conversely, the highest levels of active participation in neighbourhood watch are in Foxhills, Englefield Green East and Thorpe.

While there is little variation between male and female respondents with regard to active involvement in such schemes, those in the older age categories appear more likely to become more actively involved.

### ***3.11.8 Keeping an eye on property***

Some 56% (58% in 2004) always ask their neighbour to keep an eye on their property when leaving home for any length of time.

There is some gender variation, with 54% of male respondents stating that they always ask their neighbours to keep an eye on their property, compared to 58% of female respondents (55% and 60% respectively in 2004). Once again, those in the older age categories appear more likely to ask their neighbours to do so.

With regard to the wards, a higher proportion of respondents stated that they always asked their neighbours to keep an eye on their property in Chertsey Meads (74%), Thorpe (66%) and Foxhills (64%). Conversely the lowest proportions were in Englefield Green East (38%), Egham Town (49%) and Virginia Water (49%).

### **3.12 Other measures**

Finally, respondents were asked if any other specific actions should be taken to help reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim. Many of the responses restate those outlined in section 3.8, particularly in relation to police patrol and the extension of CCTV. Others include:

- Harsher sentencing
- Better feedback from the police
- Moving groups of young people on
- Installation of security lighting
- Changes in the law to make young people more responsible for their actions.

## 4 FOCUS GROUP RESPONSES

### 4.1 Young People's survey

#### 4.1.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 500 surveys were issued to schools in the area and 126 were returned giving a response rate of just over 25%. Respondents were asked to include their postcode on the questionnaire in order that we could ensure that we were taking into account the views of those who live in the Runnymede area. Half of the questionnaires received did not include a postcode and therefore have to be discounted from the analysis.

Some 46% of the respondents were male and 80% of all respondents were aged 14 or 15. The majority of respondents live in either the Addlestone or Chertsey areas. Only a small number of respondents live in the Egham and Virginia Water areas.

#### 4.1.2 Perceived crime problems

A summary of the proportion of the young people who responded, who perceived that there were major problems in the area, is shown below in Table 4.1.

<b>PROBLEM</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Abandoned vehicles</b>	-	14%
<b>Alcohol abuse</b>	10%	21%
<b>Burglary</b>	20%	17%
<b>Cycling on pavements</b>	15%	33%
<b>Disorder in public places</b>	10%	14%
<b>Dog fouling</b>	30%	37%
<b>Drugs misuse</b>	10%	24%
<b>Empty/derelict housing</b>	15%	8%
<b>Litter</b>	45%	46%
<b>Loud/fast cars etc.</b>	45%	40%
<b>Loud music/party</b>	20%	10%
<b>Minor assault</b>	10%	17%
<b>Neighbours</b>	10%	13%
<b>Parking on pavements</b>	30%	38%
<b>Street robbery</b>	15%	14%
<b>Under age drinking</b>	10%	25%
<b>Vandalism</b>	40%	41%
<b>Vehicle nuisance</b>	-	13%
<b>Vehicles broken into</b>	20%	21%
<b>Vehicles stolen</b>	15%	16%
<b>Young people hanging around</b>	35%	37%

**Table 4.1: Perceived major problems by young people survey group**

While the level of concern has remained constant for some categories, there has been a significant increase in concern for others, notably:

- Alcohol abuse
- Cycling on pavements
- Drugs misuse
- Under age drinking

When compared to the resident's survey it is clear that young people are generally more concerned about problems overall but significantly so in relation to vandalism, drugs misuse, litter, dog fouling and young people hanging around.

#### ***4.1.3 Victims of crime***

Some 12 (19%) of the young people had been victims of crime in the last twelve months compared to none in 2004 and 23% in 2001. Of these, one-third had been victims of minor assault and a smaller number had been victims of damage and burglary. Seven of the victims were male and 5 were female.

Exactly half of the victims reported the crime to the police. Of those who did not, half were victims of damage, which were deemed to be too minor to report. In 7 cases the victim knew the offender, primarily in relation to assault and in 4 of these cases they told the police (but only in relation to one of the assaults).

Of those who reported the crime, half were satisfied with the service that they received from the police (felt that they were given appropriate interest and feedback) and half were not (felt that the police were disinterested).

Some 32% of the young people respondents said that they knew someone who had been a victim of a crime (29% in 2004).

#### ***4.1.4 Fear of crime***

Some 16% of young respondents stated that they felt fearful of crime compared to 38% in 2004, primarily in relation to assault, robbery and general intimidation. This fear of crime is primarily fuelled by the level of crime in their area and reporting of crime in the media, but the small numbers means that this finding should be viewed with some caution.

#### ***4.1.5 Perceived safety by Area***

Some 40% stated that there were locations in the Borough where they felt unsafe compared to 43% in 2004. A quarter of these related to areas outside the Borough such as Woking, Staines and Weybridge. The primary areas identified in the Borough were:

- The canal area
- Parks, but particularly Gogmore park
- Railway stations
- Chertsey

Again however, it should be noted that these areas were only highlighted by a small number of respondents. The primary reason for fear of becoming a victim is the presence of gangs of young people and rowdiness.

#### **4.1.6 Anti-social behaviour**

Only 2 of the young respondents or 3% stated that they had been victims of ASB compared to 14% in 2004. The very small numbers, however, means that little significance should again be attached to this finding.

#### **4.1.7 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood**

In relation to satisfaction with the neighbourhood in which they are living the responses for young people are summarised, in table 4.2 below and compared to the residents' survey. Table 4.3 compares the results of the young people's survey in 2007 with those from the 2004 survey.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>Young people's group</b>	20%	70%	8%	-	1%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	36%	56%	5%	1%	2%

**Table 4.2: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, young people compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

Table 4.2 shows that the young people who responded are generally more satisfied than the respondents to the resident's survey with the neighbourhood in which they live. Table 4.3 shows the comparison with the 2004 situation and shows that the level of satisfaction has also increased in the last three years.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>2007</b>	20%	76%	8%	-	1%
<b>2004</b>	14%	71%	10%	5%	-

**Table 4.3: Young people's satisfaction with neighbourhood, 2007 compared to 2004.**

	<b>Better</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Young people's group</b>	22%	57%	8%	17%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	8%	63%	12%	17%

**Table 4.4: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, young people compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

Table 4.4 shows that young people also have a more positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents.

#### **4.1.8 Crime prevention measures**

When asked about a range of crime prevention measures and which needed improving, the following responses emerged.

<b>MEASURE</b>		
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Close passageways</b>	29%	33%
<b>Better Lighting</b>	76%	48%
<b>More Police patrol</b>	71%	52%
<b>New building design</b>	33%	48%

**Table 4.5: Crime prevention measures that need to be improved, young people's survey.**

There has been a significant increase in satisfaction in relation to lighting and police patrol. When asked what other measures could be provided, there was general support for more police patrol and more CCTV. A small number also suggested restricted licensing hours and more measures to deal with speeding traffic.

#### **4.1.9 The CCTV scheme**

Some 57% of the young people were aware of the scheme, compared to 62% in 2004. Once again, the predominant view was that the CCTV scheme has had an impact on the prevention and detection of crime but less of an impact on the fear of crime.

**4.1.10 Other crime prevention initiatives**

Asked about other schemes in the area, young people revealed the following level of awareness.

<b>INITIATIVE</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Community Safety Strategy</b>	-	5%
<b>PCSO</b>	29%	60%
<b>Crimestoppers</b>	52%	27%
<b>Neighbourhood officers</b>	5%	17%
<b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>	86%	57%
<b>Property marking</b>	14%	17%
<b>Pub Watch</b>	9%	21%
<b>Bogus Caller Initiative</b>	9%	6%
<b>Vehicle Crime Awareness</b>	14%	29%
<b>Victim support</b>	45%	43%
<b>Anti-social behaviour reporting process</b>	N/a	44%

**Table 4.6: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

The growth in awareness of PCSO and neighbourhood officers is encouraging. There has been a significant fall in awareness of generic initiatives such as crimestoppers and neighbourhood watch and the level of awareness of the community safety strategy is again perhaps disappointing.

**4.1.11: Positive action to reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim**

Table 4.7 below shows the propensity to take active crime prevention measures.

	Never (%)		Some times (%)		Usually (%)		Always (%)		N/A (%)	
	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	3	-	2	-	10	5	83	95	2	-
<b>Set burglar alarm when leaving home</b>	52	38	13	14	3	-	5	24	27	24
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	21	24	24	10	19	29	25	38	11	-
<b>Lock car when leaving it</b>	2	-	5	-	5	-	66	86	22	14
<b>Keep all valuables in car, out of sight</b>	5	-	2	-	13	24	65	67	15	10
<b>Set car alarm when leaving it</b>	22	10	6	-	6	24	40	52	26	14
<b>Active member of Neighbourhood watch</b>	36	52	13	5	2	10	8	-	41	33
<b>Ask neighbours to “keep an eye” on property.</b>	22	14	16	-	16	14	27	67	19	5

**Table 4.7: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim – young people’s group**

There has been a fall in the proportion of the young people respondents who always adopt the suggested measures, since 2004 and particularly a shift from “always” to “usually” or “sometimes” in many of the categories. This may suggest that further promotion of the need for young people to take steps to reduce their risk of becoming a victim of crime, may be required.

## 4.2 Elderly People's survey

### 4.2.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 54 surveys were generated by focus group sessions with elderly members of the community (the same as in 2004). The small number of respondents means that findings should be treated with some caution.

Some 35% of the respondents were male compared to 30% in 2004.

### 4.2.2 Perceived crime problems

A summary of the proportion of the elderly people's group who perceived that there were major problems in the area is shown below in Table 4.8.

<b>PROBLEM</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Abandoned vehicles</b>	-	2%
<b>Alcohol abuse</b>	-	2%
<b>Burglary</b>	2%	11%
<b>Cycling on pavements</b>	15%	22%
<b>Disorder in public places</b>	-	2%
<b>Dog fouling</b>	17%	13%
<b>Drugs misuse</b>	-	6%
<b>Empty/derelict housing</b>	4%	4%
<b>Litter</b>	17%	15%
<b>Loud/fast cars etc.</b>	13%	19%
<b>Loud music/party</b>	4%	6%
<b>Minor assault</b>	-	2%
<b>Neighbours</b>	4%	7%
<b>Parking on pavements</b>	17%	19%
<b>Street robbery</b>	-	6%
<b>Under age drinking</b>	4%	9%
<b>Vandalism</b>	11%	19%
<b>Vehicle nuisance</b>	9%	6%
<b>Vehicles broken into</b>	-	15%
<b>Vehicles stolen</b>	-	13%
<b>Young people hanging around</b>	9%	9%

**Table 4.8: Perceived major problems by elderly people's survey group**

There has been an increase in concern for most categories and significantly so for a number, notably:

- Burglary
- Vandalism

- Theft of and from vehicles

The results relate to small numbers however.

When compared to the overall resident's survey it is clear that the elderly group are generally more concerned about crime related problems but less concerned about quality of life and traffic problems such as litter, loud and speeding cars and dog fouling.

#### ***4.2.3 Victims of crime***

Just one of the elderly focus group has been a victim of crime in the last twelve months, the same as in 2004. The case related to a burglary, which was reported to the police and the victim was satisfied with the service provided by the police.

Some 20% of the focus group said that they knew someone who had been a victim of a crime (11% in 2004). These mainly related to burglaries.

#### ***4.2.4 Fear of crime***

Some 24% of the elderly focus group stated that they felt fearful of crime compared to 20% in 2004, though most did not state a specific crime of which they were concerned. Most stated that this made them wary when out and about and prevented a small number from going out after dark. This fear of crime is primarily fuelled by the reporting of crime in the media and police related drama on the TV, but the small numbers means that this finding should be viewed with some caution.

#### ***4.2.5 Perceived safety by Area***

Just 3 individuals or 5% stated that there were locations in the Borough where they felt unsafe compared to 11% in 2004. The three areas identified were Green Lane Chertsey, Egham and all parks.

#### ***4.2.6 Anti-social behaviour***

Only 1 of the focus group (2%) has been a victim of ASB in the last twelve months compared to 19% in 2004. The very small numbers, however, means that little significance should again be attached to this finding.

#### ***4.2.7 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood***

In relation to satisfaction with the neighbourhood in which they are living the responses for the elderly people's group are summarised, in table 4.9 below and compared to the residents' survey. Table 4.10 compares the results of the elderly people's survey in 2007 with those from the 2004 survey.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>Elderly focus group</b>	39%	52%	9%	-	-
<b>Resident's survey</b>	36%	56%	5%	1%	2%

**Table 4.9: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, elderly focus group compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

Table 4.9 shows that the members of the elderly focus group are slightly less satisfied than the respondents to the resident's survey with the neighbourhood in which they live. Table 4.10 shows the comparison with the 2004 situation and reinforces the view that the level of satisfaction has fallen in the last three years.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>2007</b>	39%	52%	9%	-	-
<b>2004</b>	43%	56%	1%	-	-

**Table 4.10: Elderly focus group satisfaction with neighbourhood, 2007 compared to 2004.**

Table 4.11 shows that members of the elderly focus group also have a less positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents. This again supports the findings regarding satisfaction with the neighbourhood.

	<b>Better</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Elderly focus group</b>	15%	44%	32%	9%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	8%	63%	12%	17%

**Table 4.11: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, elderly person's focus group compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

#### **4.2.8 Crime prevention measures**

When asked about a range of crime prevention measures and which needed improving, the following responses emerged.

MEASURE		
	2004	2007
Close passageways	2%	-
Better Lighting	9%	20%
More Police patrol	59%	65%
New building design	2%	-

**Table 4.12: Crime prevention measures that need to be improved, elderly person's focus group.**

There has been a significant fall in satisfaction in relation to lighting and less so in relation to police patrol.

#### **4.2.9 The CCTV scheme**

Some 78% of the members of the elderly focus group were aware of the scheme, compared to 80% in 2004. This is significantly higher than for the general resident's and young people's surveys.

Once again, the predominant view was that the CCTV scheme has had an impact on the prevention and detection of crime but less of an impact on the fear of crime.

#### **4.2.10 Other crime prevention initiatives**

Asked about other schemes in the area, the elderly focus group revealed the following level of awareness.

INITIATIVE		
	2004	2007
Community Safety Strategy	9%	2%
PCSO	46%	63%
Crimestoppers	54%	24%
Neighbourhood officers	31%	24%
Neighbourhood Watch	72%	57%
Property marking	43%	9%
Pub Watch	2%	6%
Bogus Caller Initiative	38%	30%
Vehicle Crime Awareness	17%	7%
Victim support	41%	17%
Anti-social behaviour reporting process	N/a	7%

**Table 4.13: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

The growth in awareness of PCSO is encouraging but the fall in awareness of neighbourhood officers is less so.

As with the young people's survey there has been a significant fall in awareness of generic initiatives such as crimestoppers, neighbourhood watch and property marking.

#### **4.2.11: Positive action to reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim**

Table 4.14 below shows the propensity to take active crime prevention measures.

	Never (%)		Some times (%)		Usually (%)		Always (%)		N/A (%)	
	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	2	-	2	-	2	2	91	96	3	2
<b>Set burglar alarm when leaving home</b>	2	-	5	-	10	-	3	4	95	96
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	2	-	3	4	13	9	74	80	8	7
<b>Lock car when leaving it</b>	-	-	-	-	-	2	19	76	81	72
<b>Keep all valuables in car, out of sight</b>	-	-	-	4	-	4	19	20	81	72
<b>Set car alarm when leaving it</b>	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	17	97	81
<b>Active member of Neighbourhood watch</b>	2	11	-	-	-	-	9	6	89	83
<b>Ask neighbours to "keep an eye" on property.</b>	16	19	6	7	11	7	43	59	24	7

**Table 4.14: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim – elderly group**

This data suggests a lower level of burglar alarm ownership than in the general resident population. The proportion of elderly who always check the identity of callers has fallen since 2004 but is still significantly higher than the level found in the residents' and young people's surveys.

Car and car alarm ownership also seems much lower than the general population. Neighbourhood Watch findings reinforce the view that there is a lack of such schemes across the Borough.

### 4.3 Vulnerable People's survey

#### 4.3.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 18 surveys were generated by focus group sessions with vulnerable members of the community (compared to 25 in 2004). The small number of respondents means that findings should be treated with considerable caution.

Some two-thirds of the respondents were male compared to 40% in 2004.

#### 4.3.2 Perceived crime problems

A summary of the proportion of the vulnerable people's group who perceived that there were major problems in the area is shown below in Table 4.15.

<b>PROBLEM</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Abandoned vehicles</b>	-	-
<b>Alcohol abuse</b>	-	11%
<b>Burglary</b>	4%	-
<b>Cycling on pavements</b>	-	-
<b>Disorder in public places</b>	-	11%
<b>Dog fouling</b>	4%	-
<b>Drugs misuse</b>	-	11%
<b>Empty/derelict housing</b>	-	-
<b>Litter</b>	-	6%
<b>Loud/fast cars etc.</b>	8%	17%
<b>Loud music/party</b>	-	6%
<b>Minor assault</b>	-	-
<b>Neighbours</b>	4%	11%
<b>Parking on pavements</b>	4%	17%
<b>Street robbery</b>	4%	-
<b>Under age drinking</b>	-	17%
<b>Vandalism</b>	-	17%
<b>Vehicle nuisance</b>	4%	-
<b>Vehicles broken into</b>	-	6%
<b>Vehicles stolen</b>	-	-
<b>Young people hanging around</b>	8%	28%

**Table 4.15: Perceived major problems by vulnerable people's survey group**

There has been an increase in concern for most categories and significantly so for a number, notably:

- Young people hanging around
- Vandalism
- Under age drinking

The results relate to small numbers however.

When compared to the overall resident's survey it is clear that the vulnerable group are generally more concerned about quality of life and traffic related problems, particularly young people hanging around, but less concerned about crime problems. This is opposite to the view expressed by the elderly group.

#### ***4.3.3 Victims of crime***

Just three of the vulnerable group (17%) have been a victim of crime in the last twelve months, compared to 25% in 2004. These relate to damage, theft from vehicle and threatening behaviour all of which were reported to the police. In two of the three cases the victim was satisfied with the service provided by the police.

Some 27% of the focus group said that they knew someone who had been a victim of a crime (24% in 2004). These mainly related to damage and vehicle crime.

#### ***4.3.4 Fear of crime***

Some 50% of the vulnerable focus group stated that they felt fearful of crime compared to 32% in 2004, mainly in relation to abuse, threatening behaviour, gangs of young people and drug dealing.

Most stated that this made them feel vulnerable and wary when out and about and prevented a small number from going out after dark. Others said that it made them cautious about letting their children out to play and two said that it increased their concern about protecting their property. This fear of crime is primarily fuelled by the reporting of crime in the media (two thirds of those who felt fearful) and being a past victim (over half of those who were fearful), but again the small numbers means that this finding should be viewed with some caution.

#### ***4.3.5 Perceived safety by Area***

Just 3 individuals or 17% stated that there were locations in the Borough where they felt unsafe compared to 2 individuals (8%) in 2004. The three areas identified were Manorcroft Road playing field, outside Tesco in Addlestone and all parks. In each of the cases, the reason given was the presence of groups of young people.

#### 4.3.6 Anti-social behaviour

Some 44% of the vulnerable group have been victims of ASB in the last twelve months compared to 16% in 2004. Over half of these took place at or outside the home of the victim. In all except two of these instances the problem related to verbal abuse, threatening and intimidating behaviour. The small numbers, however, mean that the findings should be treated with some caution.

#### 4.3.7 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood

In relation to satisfaction with the neighbourhood in which they are living the responses for the vulnerable people's group are summarised, in table 4.16 below and compared to the residents' survey. Table 4.17 compares the results of the vulnerable people's survey in 2007 with those from the 2004 survey.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>Vulnerable people' group</b>	39%	39%	17%	5%	-
<b>Resident's survey</b>	36%	56%	5%	1%	2%

**Table 4.16: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, vulnerable people's focus group compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

Table 4.16 shows that the members of the vulnerable people's group are less satisfied than the respondents to the resident's survey with the neighbourhood in which they live. Table 4.17 shows the comparison with the 2004 situation and reinforces the view that the level of satisfaction has fallen in the last three years.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>2007</b>	39%	39%	17%	5%	-
<b>2004</b>	40%	52%	4%	4%	-

**Table 4.17: Vulnerable people's group satisfaction with neighbourhood, 2007 compared to 2004.**

Table 4.18 shows that as for the elderly focus group, members of the vulnerable people's group also have a less positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents. This again supports the findings regarding satisfaction with the neighbourhood.

	<b>Better</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Vulnerable people's focus group</b>	17%	56%	22%	5%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	8%	63%	12%	17%

**Table 4.18: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, vulnerable people's focus group compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

#### **4.3.8 Crime prevention measures**

When asked about a range of crime prevention measures and which needed improving, the following responses emerged.

<b>MEASURE</b>		
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Close passageways</b>	-	17%
<b>Better Lighting</b>	4%	22%
<b>More Police patrol</b>	40%	67%
<b>New building design</b>	4%	22%

**Table 4.19: Crime prevention measures that need to be improved, vulnerable people's group.**

There has been a significant fall in satisfaction in relation to all of the categories and particularly in relation to police patrol.

#### **4.3.9 The CCTV scheme**

Some 83% of the vulnerable people's group were aware of the scheme, compared to 76% in 2004. This is significantly higher than for the general resident's and young people's surveys.

Once again, the predominant view of was that the CCTV scheme has had an impact on the prevention and detection of crime but less of an impact on the fear of crime. The level of support for the scheme is also significantly higher than that expressed in the resident's and young people's surveys.

**4.3.10 Other crime prevention initiatives**

Asked about other schemes in the area, the vulnerable people’s group revealed the following level of awareness.

<b>INITIATIVE</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Community Safety Strategy</b>	16%	33%
<b>PCSO</b>	12%	17%
<b>Crimestoppers</b>	52%	39%
<b>Neighbourhood officers</b>	16%	28%
<b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>	56%	56%
<b>Property marking</b>	12%	17%
<b>Pub Watch</b>	-	22%
<b>Bogus Caller Initiative</b>	-	17%
<b>Vehicle Crime Awareness</b>	8%	22%
<b>Victim support</b>	44%	33%
<b>Anti-social behaviour reporting process</b>	N/a	33%

**Table 4.20: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

The small increase in awareness of PCSO is perhaps disappointing but the awareness of neighbourhood officers, vehicle crime and anti-social behaviour initiatives is more encouraging.

As with the other surveys there has been a significant fall in awareness of crimestoppers.

**4.3.11: Positive action to reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim**

Table 4.21 below shows the propensity to take active crime prevention measures.

	Never (%)		Some times (%)		Usually (%)		Always (%)		N/A (%)	
	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04	07	04
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	-	-	2	-	2	-	100	96	-	4
<b>Set burglar alarm when leaving home</b>	-	-	5	-	10	-	22	24	78	76
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	11	4	17	12	33	40	33	40	6	4
<b>Lock car when leaving it</b>	-	-	6	-	11	-	33	52	50	48
<b>Keep all valuables in car, out of sight</b>	6	12	11	-	28	12	-	24	55	52
<b>Set car alarm when leaving it</b>	-	-	-	-	6	-	28	36	66	64
<b>Active member of Neighbourhood watch</b>	11	48	-	4	6	-	17	12	66	36
<b>Ask neighbours to “keep an eye” on property.</b>	22	17	6	12	17	16	17	28	27	28

**Table 4.21: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim – vulnerable people’s group.**

The responses of this group in relation to checking caller identity are perhaps disappointing in that there has been little change to the 2004 position. Across most categories it appears that members of the vulnerable group are taking less action to reduce their risk of becoming a crime victim than they were three years ago.

## 5 SURVEY OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

### 5.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 119 questionnaire responses were received or 24% of those issued, compared to the 30% in 2004. Table 5.1 below shows the composition of each survey sample by sector.

<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2004</b>
<b>Retail</b>	21.0%	23.5%
<b>Industrial</b>	11.8%	13.1%
<b>Service</b>	58.8%	51.7%
<b>Other</b>	8.4%	11.7%

**Table 5.1: Survey sample by sector**

This shows that the service sector is more heavily represented than in the 2004 survey and this is a trend that has run through the surveys as far back as 1998. This may reflect a change in the economic structure within the Borough.

Some 83% of those business survey respondents have been in the area for more than ten years compared to 69% in 2004. Again this is a trend that also runs back to 1998 again perhaps reflecting that the service sector is becoming more established in the Borough area.

Some 68% of the businesses surveyed employ 10 people or less, which is somewhat more than the 53% found in the 2004 survey.

In terms of location, as those owning businesses might not be aware of the ward in which they were located, they were asked to provide the postcode area. While this is useful, it must be remembered that postcode boundaries do not align exactly with the Borough boundaries. They do however give an indication of the broad areas in which the business sample is located, as shown in Table 5.2 below.

	<b>% of sample 2004</b>	<b>% of sample 2007</b>
KT16 – Chertsey, Ottershaw	34.6	36.3
TW20 – Egham, Englefield Green	33.0	28.3
KT15 – Addlestone area	28.1	31.0
GU25 – Virginia Water	4.3	4.4

**Table 5.2: Location of business respondents**

This shows that a slightly greater proportion of respondents are located in the Addlestone area than in 2004 with a slightly smaller proportion drawn from the Egham area.

## 5.2 Perceived crime problems

Businesses were asked whether they felt that the area in which they were sited suffered particular crime problems and if so whether they were major problems or small ones. The major problems are listed below in rank order, according to the proportion of respondents who felt them to be so.

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2004</b>
Loud/fast cars and motorcycles	26.1	18.7
Litter	24.4	25.3
Young people hanging around	21.8	24.0
Parking on pavements/verges	20.2	20.0
Damage and vandalism	18.5	21.3
Vehicles broken into	18.5	18.0
Burglary	17.6	18.7
Cycling on pavements	15.1	16.0
Other vehicle nuisance	11.8	21.3
Under age drinking	11.8	12.7
Dog fouling	10.9	11.3
Vehicles being stolen	8.4	7.3
Alcohol abuse	7.6	12.7
Drug misuse (dealers and users)	6.7	3.3
Disorder in public places	5.9	12.0
Minor assault	5.9	4.6
Street robbery	4.2	2.7
Abandoned vehicles	2.5	N/a
Neighbours	1.7	3.3
Loud music/parties	1.7	2.0
Empty, derelict buildings	1.7	6.7

**Table 5.3: Percentage of business respondents who perceive major crime and anti-social behaviour problems.**

As in 2004, the main problems identified are those, which most affect businesses, (particularly in town centre areas), such as litter, young people hanging around and traffic i.e. speeding and parking problems.

There has been a significant reduction in concern in relation to a number of categories, notably under age drinking, alcohol abuse and disorder.

The following areas have been identified by respondents as more problematic with regard to specific problems.

- Chertsey area
  - Drugs misuse
  - Litter
  - Under age drinking
  - Speeding vehicles
  - Parking
  
- Addlestone area
  - Under age drinking
  - Young people hanging around

The proportion of respondents who perceive small problems is also higher than in 2004 and broadly in line with the ranking of major problems.

### **5.3 Business specific problems**

Businesses were then asked if they perceived any problems in the area, in which they were sited, specific to business. Only two issues were raised as a significant concerns, namely shop theft (9% but related to the retail sector only) and vandalism (8% of those responding compared to 16% in 2004).

A number of small problems have remained since the last survey however, though the level of concern is generally lower than in 2004, the only exception being damage.

- Damage - 35% (31% in 2004)
- Fraud – 22% (24% in 2004)
- Industrial theft – 15% (22% in 2004)
- Shoplifting – 21% (21% in 2004)
- Internal theft – 12% (18% in 2004)

There is no clear pattern with regard to the greater concern in some areas.

#### 5.4 Victims of crime

Some 39% of businesses interviewed had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months, which is comparable with the 43% in 2004 and the 46% identified in the 2001 survey.

In addition, just over a quarter of these had been a victim of crime on more than one occasion.

Of those businesses who had been a victim of crime, 32% had been a victim of general theft (19% in 2004), 28% had been victims of vandalism (16% in 2004). None had been victim of burglary (compared to 16% in 2004). The rest of the victims had suffered from such offences as shoplifting, theft of and from vehicles, and violence to staff though not in significant numbers.

A significantly higher number of victims were from the Chertsey and Addlestone areas overall.

Some 89% of victims had reported the crimes compared to 86% in 2004. Of the small number who did not report, all except one stated that they felt that nothing would happen as a result, so there was no point.

#### 5.5 Fear of crime

Some 14, or 12% of businesses responding felt that fear of crime was having an impact on trade; the same as in 2004. Just over one-third of these stated that fear of crime prevented customers from coming into an area, particularly after dark.

Table 5.4 shows that business survey respondents have a less positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents. Over half who responded, however, answered "Don't know".

	<b>Better</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Vulnerable people's focus group</b>	3%	39%	7%	51%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	8%	63%	12%	17%

**Table 5.4: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, business survey respondents compared to resident's survey, 2007.**

## 5.6 Crime prevention measures

Table 5.5 shows the views of businesses in 2007 with regard to the need to improve existing crime prevention measures compared to 2004.

<b>MEASURE</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2004</b>
<b>Close passageways</b>	19.3%	16.0%
<b>Better Lighting</b>	33.6%	28.7%
<b>More police</b>	72.2%	69.3%
<b>Building design</b>	16.8%	20.6%

**Table 5.5: The need for improvements to crime prevention measures**

These results clearly show an increase in satisfaction in relation to all of the measures stated since the 2004 survey with the exception of building design. Improved passageways are seen as an issue in Addlestone, while there is more of a call for better lighting and increased policing in Chertsey and Virginia Water.

In terms of other measures, some 7% of those surveyed requested more visible police patrol and 6% also suggested that there should be an extension of the CCTV scheme.

## 5.7 The CCTV scheme

Respondents were asked whether they were aware of the CCTV scheme in the Borough and if so, whether they thought it was having an effect. The results of both the 2007 and 2004 surveys are summarised in Table 5.6 below.

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2004</b>
<b>Those aware of CCTV</b>	64%	71%
<b>% who think it will reduce crime</b>	51%	64%
<b>% who think it will reduce fear of crime</b>	43%	48%
<b>% who think it will increase detection of crime</b>	54%	62%

**Table 5.6: Perceptions with regard to the CCTV scheme**

These findings are consistent with those from the resident's survey and show that the proportion of respondents who are aware of the system and who perceive that the system has a positive impact has continued to fall. Levels of awareness are greater for businesses in Addlestone.

### **5.8 Business specific crime prevention issues**

Respondents were asked approximately how much funding, if any, they provided for crime prevention in their business. Some 82% of those surveyed answered this question compared to 84% in 2004. Of these, 81% stated that they provided nothing, which is broadly comparable with the 83% recorded in 2004. There appears to be no significant variation in relation to the size or location of business.

A further 3% (4% in 2004) stated that they did set funding aside for crime prevention but they either did not know exactly how much (set by Head Office) or they refused to divulge the amount.

Only 15 of those surveyed were therefore prepared to state how much they set aside and the most common figure was 2% of turnover.

Businesses were then asked if they expected to provide for the costs of crime in the future and if so, how much? Some 84% stated that they did not expect to make provision in the future compared to 76% in 2004, 66% in 2001 and 47% in the 1998 survey. Once again, this is a disappointing result and it can be seen the continuation of a trend that runs back to 1998.

Of the 16% who did intend to provide in the future, only a small number were able or prepared to put a value on the provision. Most saw their annual alarm rental, insurance premiums and in-house CCTV schemes as sufficient crime prevention funding. A number also stated however that they would set aside between 1% and 2% of turnover for such purposes.

### **5.9 Impact of crime on staff**

Some 65% of those interviewed stated that they did take steps to encourage staff to reduce opportunities for crime in the workplace. This compares with 69% in 2004 and 78% in 2001 and reinforces the trend described above.

Of these 65%, it appears that many (17%) do little more than encourage staff to be watchful and vigilant. Others (39%) encourage staff to secure the premises at night and lock all valuables away. Only 6% state that they train staff in security and crime prevention issues.

Some 26 business respondents suggested that crime in the workplace had an impact on staff compared to just 29 in 2004. Of these, a large number did not state how they felt staff were impacted, though one quarter felt that staff morale had been affected.

### **5.10 Self monitoring**

Some 32% of business respondents indicated that they had some form of internal CCTV system to prevent crime (27% in 2004). Of these, 84% were monitored in-house (68% in 2004). Just 1 or 3% (10% in 2004) stated that the system was not monitored **at all** and the improvement is encouraging.

A total of 17% (30% in 2001, 29% in 1998) said that they were aware of the services offered by the Safer Runnymede Centre (mainly in the retail sector). While this is encouraging, a number did suggest that the facilities were too expensive to utilise and they would not be making use of the opportunity.